

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/716,544	Applicant(s) MENG, TERESA H.	
	Examiner FEBEN HAILE	Art Unit 2416	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) FEBEN HAILE. (3) Aung Moe.

(2) Jun Lee (Reg. No. 40,262). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 15 October 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 43-54.

Identification of prior art discussed: I et al. (US 6,088,335).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants representative clarified distinctions between applicants claimed invention and the prior art such that proposed amendments were discussed in relation to possibly overcome the reference applied to the current claims such that a further consideration will be forthcoming accordingly.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/FEBEN HAILE/ Examiner, Art Unit 2416	/Aung S. Moe/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2416
--	---